

that are being made—we are going to continually have to face our responsibility to face the moral and ethical challenges and limits. It is our responsibility, as individuals, as part of this body politic, to reassess whatever constructs we come up with that frame and that govern biomedical research.

It is uncomfortable, it is challenging, and it causes each of us to go back and study the science which can be confusing for everyone, including scientists as well as nonscientists, and to look at the framework—both moral and ethical framework that individuals have and that we have—in representing the people of our States, our constituents.

I said 5 years ago, on July 18, 2001, and I believe now that we must also do all we can to pursue promising alternative strategies that hold the magnificent potential for developing these powerful pluripotent cell lines without damaging or destroying nascent human life.

That is why, in the package we will be looking at Monday, I have asked the Senate to consider legislation to enhance support for alternatives to embryonic stem cell research.

I have worked very closely with my distinguished colleague from Georgia, who is occupying the chair, on this very issue. I have asked Senators SANTORUM and SPECTER to work together, and they have done a tremendous job in crafting the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, S. 2754, in this regard. Their bill is very similar to the legislation that Senator ISAKSON and I and a number of other colleagues introduced last year. And I encourage every Senator to look very carefully at it because I believe every Senator should be able to support that bill.

There is no reason why that piece of legislation should not unite this body and be something that everybody can support.

Third is the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act of 2006. People ask the question—and I have been asked over the course of today and the reason I wanted to come back to the floor and close and begin to frame the debate—what is fetus farming? It is the implantation, growth or gestation of an embryo in a human or in an animal for the purpose of aborting that growing fetus for re-

search. Fetus farming is not currently employed. But it is forward thinking because it is a trend that we could inadvertently move to in trying to advance science, and that line should not be crossed. Therefore, Senators BROWNBACK and SANTORUM have proposed legislation that would draw a clear line that should not be crossed—a clear line that is not there today.

Again, 5 years ago on July 18, when I outlined the proposal on the floor, it was covered in an article in the Wall Street Journal on that same day. I outlined my principles. Shortly after—1 month later—the President laid out the administration's policy on embryonic stem cell research.

A lot of people do not pay attention to it today.

The President's legislation was the first Federal legislation to fund embryonic stem cell research. It did so within an ethical framework, a moral and ethical framework. It showed respect for basic human life.

President Bush and I do not differ about the need for strong guidelines supporting embryonic stem cell research. His policy was generally consistent with the principles I set forth a month before his announcement in 2001. However, what has now sort of changed, since that point in time, is science has progressed over the last 5 years, and I feel that the limit on cell lines available for federally funded research, those original limits—given what has happened in science today and what we have learned—are too restrictive.

Because people's views shift, let me refer back to the principle I presented 5 years ago. The fifth principle which I presented on the floor 5 years ago, No. 5, and I quote:

Provide funding for embryonic stem cell research only from blastocysts that would otherwise be discarded. We need to allow Federal funding for research using only those embryonic stem cells derived from blastocysts that are left over after in vitro fertilization and would otherwise be discarded.

I quote that to point out that that was my stance 5 years ago, and indeed when people ask: Why, Senator FRIST, or Dr. FRIST, are you supporting the House bill, you can see the consistency there.

This is very important. H.R. 810, despite its many shortcomings which I

mentioned last week, is clearly consistent with that principle. And the bill applies this restriction almost verbatim. The very words “would otherwise be discarded” were from my remarks 5 years ago and is also in the House bill.

All three of the bills the Senate will address raise profound ethical questions. They will require a lot of thought, a lot of study over the course of the next several days. They are challenging to us as a body and challenging to us as individuals. They merit serious debate. That is why I am pleased, on an issue of this magnitude, that Senators will have an opportunity to have their ideas considered in an orderly, respectful and dignified way and voted on separately and clearly.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 17, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 17, 2006, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 14, 2006:

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### To be general

GEN. BANTZ J. CRADDOCK, 0000

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, July 14, 2006:

##### FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PHILIP D. MOELLER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2010.

JON WELLINGHOFF, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2008.

MARC SPITZER, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2011.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.